

REMARKS

Claims 1-22 are pending in the application. Claims 1, 14, 17 and 21 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph, as failing to comply with the enablement requirement. Claims 1-3 and 8 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over *Digital Tigers SideCar PlusTwo Pro Specification Sheet* (DT2) in view of U.S. Patent No. 7,123,212 issued to Acharya et al. and with evidence by *Digital Tigers SideCar PlusFour Pro Installation and User Guide* (DT4). Claim 4 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over DT2 in view of Acharya with evidence by DT4 and U.S. Patent No. 6,311,263 issued to Barlow et al. Claims 5 and 6 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over DT2 in view of Acharya with evidence by DT4 and U.S. Patent No. 6,584,561 issued to Merkin et al. Claim 7 stands rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over DT2 in view of Acharya with evidence by DT4 and U.S. Publication No. 2002/0036694 issued to Merrill. The Examiner states that Claims 9-22 are directed to a method and a system with substantially similar limitations as in Claims 1-8 above and stand rejected under the same grounds.

Applicant has amended Claims 1, 3, 4, 14 and 17-22 to remove the term “multiplexer” and use the term “selector” as suggested by the Examiner. Applicant respectfully submits that no new matter is added by the change since the underlying function of the component is described in the written description.

Applicant respectfully submits that the references cited by the Examiner cannot make obvious Claims 1-22 because the references fail to teach, disclose or suggest all elements recited by Claims 1-22. For example, each of Claims 1-22 recite a “docking station” which is not taught, disclosed or suggested by the references cited by the Examiner. The Examiner equates the PC card connector at page 16 of the Digital Tiger reference to the docking connector, however, this ignores the common meaning of the term “docking station” as used with respect to portable information handling systems and as presented in Applicant’s written description. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests that the Examiner withdraw the rejections of Claims 1-22 and issue a notice of allowance without further delay.

CONCLUSION

In view of the amendments and remarks set forth herein, the application is believed to be in condition for allowance and a notice to that effect is solicited. Nonetheless, should any issues remain that might be subject to resolution through a telephonic interview, the examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned.

The Commissioner is authorized to deduct any additional fees which may be necessary and to credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 502264.

I hereby certify that this correspondence is being electronically submitted to the COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS via EFS on June 26, 2007.

/Robert W. Holland/

Attorney for Applicant(s)

Respectfully submitted,

/Robert W. Holland/

Robert W. Holland
Attorney for Applicant(s)
Reg. No. 40,020